



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fine Chaucer's word correctly) gives generous assistance. Under the forms *lavender*, *launder*, *laundress*, two definitions of the word are given: 1. a person who washes linen; 2. a caretaker of Chambers in the Inns of Court. Chaucer's word is quoted under the first head. The use there and in other places will help us to arrive at a third definition.

One of the earliest occurrences of the word is in the legend of St. Brice (*Alleng. Leg. Neue Folge*, p. 156):

þan bifell on þis manere :
A woman þat his lander was
In þat tyme had done trespas :
Flesly scho had hir body filde,
And was deliuer of a knaue-childe.

This *lander* was one who "come and gede, and wessche his clothes, when þai had nede," and the innocent St. Brice is accused of complicity in her 'trespas.'

In a fourteenth-century ballad (Wright, *Specimens of Lyric Poetry*, p. 49), in which an old man describes the joys of his youth, we again find the word in evil surroundings:

Whil mi lif wes luther ant lees,
Glotonie mi glemon wes,
With me he wonede a while;
Prude was my plowe fere,
Lecherie my lavandere,
With hem is gabbe and gyle.

The dictionary reference to Barbour's *Bruce* again does not bring out the specific color of the word as there used. It occurs in the episode of the king and the laundress in labor (xvi, ll. 270-292), and the laundress is here taken as the type of a creature least worthy the king's notice.

To these three examples of the use of the word may be added another, taken from the story of Edmund Leversegge, an unpublished narrative preserved in a British Museum manuscript (Addit. ms. 34, 193), of which I possess a copy. The story tells of a vision which came to one Edmund Leversegge of Frome, in the county of Somerset, on the eve of the feast of Corpus Christi, 1465, during a time of pestilence. In this vision Edmund is directed to proceed to the University of Oxford and spend some years there in the study of theology. He receives specific directions as to his behavior

there, and certain pleasant vices he is warned against, among them one in the following words:

Also she seid I charg þe þat þou go neuer to þi lauender howse ne lett her com in þi chamber as long as þou art in Oxforthe. Moreover I charge þe þat wat tyme þou felist þi flesch rebell agens þi saule, use þou to fast bred and watur, and on day in þe weeke I charg þe to fast watur, etc. (f. 130).

In two later occurrences of the word, the meaning *meretrix* is beyond question. In Greene's *Groatworth of Wit* (ed. Brydges, p. 65), in the tale of the evil life of Roberto, we are told that

"he had shift of lodgings, where in every place his hostess writ up the remembrance of him, his laundress, and his boy; for they were ever his in [that is, inn] household; besides retainers in sundry other places."

The context here shows that *laundress* can mean only *mistress*. Again in Webster's *White Devil* (act iii, sc. ii, p. 65, Symond's edition), Francisco, in turning over the leaves of a book which contains the names of all offenders lurking in the city says, when he comes to the large section devoted to the harlots:

Did I want
Ten leash of courtzezans, it would furnish me;
Nay, laundress three armies. That in so little paper
Should lie the undoing of so many men!

It is an interesting meeting of extremes when Spanish *cortesana* and French-English *lavender* come together in the same meaning.

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP.

Columbia University.

HEINE AND WILHELM MÜLLER.

I.

In the early years of his literary career, before he had gained such fame as to make him independent, Heine did not weary of casting about for patrons and friends among the prominent authors of his time. Even the incomplete correspondence in the last volumes of the Hamburg edition of Heine's works includes a considerable number of letters written

with the evident, though somewhat covert object of gaining the favor of men who could be useful to an ambitious young poet striving for public recognition. Unfortunately, not all these letters can be said to bear the stamp of ingenuous sincerity; Heine did not hesitate, on occasion, to use the luring bait of flattery, and his flattery is palpably calculating rather than frankly enthusiastic. It is not at all surprising, of course, to find Heine positively deifying Goethe, and attributing his poetic inspiration to Goethe's influence, in a letter dated December 29, 1821; it is somewhat of a shock, however, to find a letter to Adolf Müllner, written the very next day, in which Heine adroitly caresses the author of *Die Schuld* in order to coax a favorable review of his *Gedichte* from Müllner the influential editor; he even goes so far as to assure Hofrat Müllner, with an easy pun, that *Die Schuld* is to blame for his, Heine's, having become a poet. A year and a half later, May 4, 1823, Heine takes pains to write to the curious pedant and collector, Maximilian Schottky, that the latter's Austrian folk-songs had strongly affected the form of the poems in the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, and June 10, 1823, to Fouqué, of the influence of the ballad of Doña Clara in the *Zauberring* upon *Almansor*. These two statements happen to be correct enough. Quite different with a letter written at the same time, May 4, 1823, to Uhland,¹ in which Heine pretends to "a harmony of sentiment and life" with the good Swabian that certainly never existed; nor does it appear that Uhland was at all deceived by this pretense, for there is no evidence that he ever returned Heine's advances.

Wilhelm Müller was one of the poets whose friendship Heine made a special effort to gain in the manner suggested; and it happens that we have a letter to Müller that contains a most interesting confession of literary indebtedness. This letter probably was not the first Heine addressed to Müller; it is more than likely that he wrote an earlier letter to accompany the copy of the *Tragödien nebst einem lyrischen Intermezzo* sent to Müller in 1823, with the inscription

¹ *Deutsche Revue* xxii, 152.

"Als ein Zeichen seiner Achtung und mit dem besonderen Wunsche, dass der Waldhornist das lyrische Intermezzo seiner Aufmerksamkeit würdige, überreicht dieses Buch der Verfasser."²

Unfortunately, the whole of Wilhelm Müller's library and correspondence was destroyed by fire, and the letter of June, 1826, Max Müller tells us, "escaped only because my mother, a great admirer of Heine, had preserved it among her treasures."

How Müller received Heine's advances it is impossible to say. Heine speaks in the letter just mentioned of the "liebevolle Aufnahme, welche meine Tragödien und Lieder bei Ihnen gefunden," but if that refers to a direct answer, this answer is not now extant. Heine may refer here—a lapse of memory would explain the inexactness of the reference—to a very brief and not very enthusiastic notice by Müller of a cycle of seventeen lyrics contributed by Heine to the *Aurora* for 1823, almost all of which were soon after incorporated in the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*. The notice runs as follows:

"Siebzehn Lieder von H. Heine, der unlängst eine Gedichtsammlung zu Berlin herausgegeben hat, verdienen Aufmerksamkeit. Es herrscht in ihnen ein freier, eigenthümlicher Klang, und unter einigen unbedeutenden und verfehlten zeichnen sich mehrere durch Originalität der Empfindung aus."³

Müller then singles out the poems now numbered 14, 16, 29, and 35 in the *Intermezzo*. When this somewhat grudging and very meagre bit of criticism—the only mention of Heine's name in Müller's collected works—is compared with the enthusiastic praise Müller lavished upon other poets who were very inferior to Heine, the natural inference is that the latter did not appeal strongly to his sympathy. At the same time, it is not at all probable that Müller shared the hostile attitude of his friends, the Swabians, towards Heine; in that case, his wife would scarcely have been "a great admirer of Heine."

However that may be, Heine's expressed

² The late Professor F. Max Müller still had this copy in his possession; see *Cosmopolis*, vol. iv, 635.

³ *Müller's vermischte Schriften*, ed. by Schwab, Leipzig, 1830, v, 430.

admiration for Müller was certainly sincere and lasting; for while his early praise of Schlegel and Uhland, for instance, gives way to sarcastic disparagement, he never mentions Müller without respect, and even affection. In the *Harzreise*, Müller is one of the poets whose "beautiful songs" are sung upon the Brocken (Elster iii, 162); and it seems significant that, whereas in the first redaction, 1825, Uhland is mentioned first, in the second, 1827, Müller's name leads. In *Italien*, 1828, (Elster iii, 265), a reference to "des allzufrüh verstorbenen W. Müllers *Rom, Römer und Römerinnen*" calls forth the lament "ach, er war ein deutscher Dichter!" Finally, the mention of Müller in the *Romantische Schule*, 1832-3 (Elster v, 350), is unusually sympathetic:

"Wilhelm Müller, den uns der Tod in seiner heitersten Jugendfülle entrissen, muss hier ebenfalls erwähnt werden. In der Nachbildung des deutschen Volkslieds klingt er ganz zusammen mit Herrn Uhland; mich will es sogar bedünken, als sei er in solchem Gebiete manchmal glücklicher und übertrage ihn an Natürlichkeit. Er erkannte tiefer den Geist der alten Liederformen und brauchte sie daher nicht äusserlich nachzuahmen; wir finden daher bei ihm ein freieres Handhaben der Uebergänge und ein verständiges Vermeiden aller veralteten Wendungen und Ausdrücke."

By far the most important document for the relation of Heine to Müller, however, is the letter of June 7th, 1826,⁴ sent with a copy of the *Reisebilder*. The following extracts will indicate the character of this letter, the most explicit testimony Heine ever gave of his indebtedness to another poet:

"Ich bin gross genug, Ihnen offen zu bekennen, dass mein kleines Intermezzo-Metrum nicht bloss zufällige Aehnlichkeit mit Ihrem gewöhnlichen Metrum hat, sondern dass es wahrscheinlich seinen geheimsten Tonfall Ihren Liedern verdankt, indem es die lieben Müllerschen Lieder waren, die ich zu eben der Zeit kennen lernte, als ich das Intermezzo schrieb. Ich habe sehr früh schon das deutsche Volkslied auf mich einwirken lassen; späterhin, als ich in Bonn studierte, hat mir August Schlegel viel metrische Geheimnisse aufgeschlossen, aber ich glaube erst in Ihren Liedern den reinen Klang und die wahre Einfachheit,

wonach ich immer strebte, gefunden zu haben. Wie rein, wie klar sind Ihre Lieder und sämtlich sind es Volkslieder. In meinen Gedichten hingegen, ist nur die Form einigermaßen volksthümlich, der Inhalt gehört der konventionellen Gesellschaft. Ja, ich bin gross genug, es sogar bestimmt zu wiederholen, und Sie werden es mal öffentlich ausgesprochen finden, dass mir durch die Lektüre Ihrer 77 Gedichte zuerst klar geworden, wie man aus den alten vorhandenen Volksliederformen neue Formen bilden kann, die ebenfalls volksthümlich sind, ohne dass man nöthig hat, die alten Sprachholperigkeiten und Unbeholfenheiten nachzuahmen. Im zweiten Theile Ihrer Gedichte fand ich die Form noch reiner und durchsichtiger—doch, was spreche ich Viel von Formwesen, es drängt mich mehr, Ihnen zu sagen, dass ich keinen Liederdichter ausser Goethe so sehr liebe wie Sie. Uhlands Ton ist nicht eigenthümlich genug und gehört eigentlich den alten Gedichten an, woraus er seine Stoffe, Bilder und Wendungen nimmt. Unendlich reicher und origineller ist Rückert, aber ich habe an ihm zu tadeln Alles, was ich an mir selbst tadle: wir sind uns im Irrthum verwandt und er wird mir oft so unendlich, wie ich es mir selbst werde. Nur Sie, Wilhelm Müller, bleiben mir also rein geniessbar übrig, mit Ihrer ewigen Frische und jugendlichen Ursprünglichkeit. . . . Ich bin eitel genug zu glauben, dass mein Name einst, wenn wir Beide nicht mehr sind, mit dem Ihrigen zusammen genannt wird—darum lasst uns auch im Leben liebevoll verbunden sein."

Heine himself was not the first to call attention to the similarity in tone between his *Intermezzo* and Müller's lyrics. An anonymous reviewer of the *Intermezzo* in *Brockhaus' Litterarisches Conversationsblatt*, Sept. 23, 1824, wrote as follows:

"Keine Nachahmung oder Ähnlichkeit, aber eine innere, gleichsam musikalische Verwandtschaft im Anschlagen desselben Tones, in einem ähnlichen Tonfalle, in einer gleich leichten Behandlung der Sprache und im glücklichen Versbaue mit den Liedern Wilhelm Müllers ist mir darin aufgefallen. Doch wer weiss, ob dies nicht mehr ein individuelles dunkles Gefühl als etwas Wirkliches ist?"

As Heine mentions this particular review with high praise in a letter to Moses Moser (June 24, 1825), it may be inferred that its phraseology was not without influence upon the strikingly similar words of the letter to Müller.

Let us now see what evidence can be found to test the correctness of the statements Heine makes in his letter as to Müller's influence

⁴ *Werke*, Hamburg, 1861-3, xix, 273; also in *Heines Briefe* ed. by Steinmann, i, 47, and in part in Strodtmann's biography, second ed., i, 235, and in G. Karpeles, *H. Heines Autobiographie*, Berlin, 1888, pp. 149, 195.

upon his poetry. The tendency towards insincere flattery with an ulterior motive which appears in other of Heine's letters, makes a close examination of these statements necessary.

No one can read the first two collections of lyrics in Heine's works—the *Junge Leiden*, including poems written 1817 to 1821, and the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, almost all of which was composed in 1822—without feeling the marked difference between them, such a difference as does not exist between the *Intermezzo* and *Die Heimkehr*, following immediately after it, 1823-4. The principal points of difference, apart from the subject-matter, appear to be these:—There is a great deal of crudity, harshness, and roughness in the poems of *Junge Leiden*, an affectation of primitiveness in the persistent use of archaic forms, an abuse of diminutives and of the horrible, a certain monotony of rhythm and of rhyme, due, for example, to the unbroken flow of trochaic or iambic movement, and the regular beat of exclusively masculine endings. The poems of the *Intermezzo*, on the contrary, are simple without archaic affectation, smooth and melodious without monotony, and characterized by a propriety of diction that is found but rarely in the earlier collection. It is evident enough that in the *Junge Leiden* Heine was misled into superficial imitation of the *Volkslied*, and that he finds himself, so to speak, in the *Intermezzo*. The time of transition can even be fixed with fair precision; the first poems in the characteristic tone of the *Intermezzo* are the tenth *Traumbild* (Da hab' ich viel blasse Leichen Beschworen mit Wortesmacht), and the third of the *Lieder* (Ich wandelte unter den Bäumen Mit meinem Gram allein), both dated 1821; and even in these there is a trace of the earlier harshness. Now this time of transition coincides closely with the appearance of Müller's 77 *Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, published 1821, the very collection whose influence upon his *Intermezzo* Heine admits in his letter to Müller. Furthermore, these poems of Müller have precisely the qualities of simplicity, clearness, unaffected popular style, and insinuating melody, that distinguished Heine's *Intermezzo* from his earlier verse. We even have clear evi-

dence, if it were needed, that the change in Heine's manner was not a matter of unconscious development, but was the direct result of new artistic insight. Heine had announced his *Gedichte* in 1821, as "ganz im Geist und im schlichten Ton des deutschen Volksliedes geschrieben" (Elster i, 2). His new conception, at the same time a tacit condemnation of his own earlier practice, appears in a review of his friend Rousseau's poems, in *Der Gesellschafter*, Berlin, July 14, 1823:

"Es kommt darauf an, den Geist der Volksliedformen zu erfassen und mit der Kenntnis desselben nach unserem Bedürfnis gemodelte, neue Formen zu bilden. Abgeschmackt klingen daher die Titulaturvolkslieder jener Herren, die den heutigsten Stoff aus der gebildeten Gesellschaft mit einer Form umkleiden, die vielleicht ein ehrlicher Handwerksbursche vor zweihundert Jahren für den Erguss seiner Gefühle passend gefunden. Der Buchstabe tötet, doch der Geist macht lebendig (Elster vii, 220)."⁵

As everything tends to confirm Heine's general statement of his indebtedness to Müller, so with the specific statement: "Mein kleines Intermezzo-Metrum hat nicht bloss zufällige Ähnlichkeit mit Ihrem gewöhnlichen Metrum." The reference must be to the flowing iambic-anapestic rhythm of the "Hildebrands-ton," the measure of Goethe's *König in Thule* and Heine's *Lorelei*, which is the characteristic meter both of Müller's 77 *Gedichte* and of Heine's *Intermezzo* and *Heimkehr*. A bit of comparative statistics on the lyric poetry most read by Heine at this time will be illuminative. In the first volume of Goethe's poems, of 150 *Lieder* and ballads only 4% are in the

⁵ A few years later, Müller formulates the theory that underlies his own practice in strikingly similar terms, in an essay published in *Hermes*, 1827 (Vermischte Schriften, iv, 105):

"Die eigenthümliche Natur des Volksliedes ist die Unmittelbarkeit seiner Wirkung auf das Leben. Das Leben kann aber nur durch das Leben lebendig ausgesprochen werden. Daher ist ein heillosen Irrthum einiger Modedichter der nächsten Vergangenheit, dass sie Volkslieder zu geben meinten, wenn sie alterthümliche Phrasen, unbeholfene Wendungen, auch wohl gemeine Derbheiten aus den alten Vorbildern nachhüpfend zu neuen Verbindung n zusammenfügten. Keiner Dichtungsart liegt es mehr ob als der lyrischen, zeitgemäss zu sein. . . . Die sogenannte altdeutsche Schule hat in solchen Verirrungen besonders ihr Mögliches gethan. Es hätte nicht viel gefehlt, so wären neue Volkslieder in der Sprache des alten Ludwigsliedes gesungen worden. Und warum nicht? Jene Sprache hat doch einmal gelebt, aber die Sprache der neumodigen Volkslieder hat niemals gelebt. Und welcher Mensch kann dem Todtgeborenen Leben einhauchen?"

Hildebrandston; in the three volumes of the *Wunderhorn* only 2% of about 850 numbers are in this form; among Brentano's secular poems 8%; in Uhland's *Gedichte* (1815), of 135 *Lieder* and ballads 11%; of the 61 lyrics in Eichendorff's *Ahnung und Gegenwart*, 18%, but scattered as they were through the length of the novel, they could hardly make such a mass impression as if they had been collected. Müller's first published poems, the ones appearing in the little circulated collection *Bundesblüthen* (1816), do not show a preference for the Hildebrandston, as only two of them are in this meter. In the 77 *Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, 1821, the Hildebrandston suddenly appears as the overwhelmingly predominant note; of 64 *Lieder* and ballads, just 25% are in this form. In the second collection of the *Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, 1824, also mentioned by Heine, 18% of the ninety poems are still in this meter, and about the same proportion holds for the mass of the later poems in ordinary German stanzas.

For purposes of comparison, I have arranged Heine's poems according to the years of their production, not according to published collections; the question of course being, not whether a poem happens to appear in the *Intermezzo* or some other collection, but whether it was written before or after 1821. For the dates Elster's chronological list was used (vii, 646 ff.); though this list is not absolutely reliable, it is quite sufficiently so to serve our statistical purpose. The figures run as follows: Before 1821 Heine wrote 60 *Lieder* and ballads, and 8% of them are in the Hildebrandston; in 1821 of 45 poems 29% are in this form; in 1822 (year of the *Intermezzo*) of 71 poems 49%; in 1823-4 (years of the *Heimkehr* and the *Harzreise*) of 111 poems 39%; in 1825-6 (years of the *Nordsee* and its free rhythms) of 9 strophic poems none are in this meter; in the ten years 1827-36 of 157 poems 10%; in the last twenty years of Heine's life this meter disappeared almost completely—there are only two poems among some 230, or less than 1%, in the Hildebrandston.

It appears immediately that the Hildebrandston is even far more predominant in Heine's poetry from 1821 to 1824 than in Müller's collections of 1821 and 1824, and that this striking

predominance again exactly coincides with the influence of Müller's poetry, to which Heine bears witness. One important difference must he noted, however: that Müller's poems in this form are almost all purely iambic, while with Heine there is just as decided a preference for largely anapestic rhythm. The difference is, indeed, generally characteristic; in all rising rhythms, Heine tends strongly toward anapestic movement, while with Müller anapests are always exceptional. But again, it appears that one of the two anapestic poems in the Hildebrandston in Müller's 77 *Gedichte* made a particularly strong impression upon Heine, judging by evident reminiscences of it in his poems; it is *Thränenregen*, beginning "Wir sassen so traulich beisammen."

Besides the Hildebrandston, two others of Müller's stanzas might be mentioned, because of their relative frequency in the 77 *Gedichte* and the reminiscences of them that seem to appear in Heine's poems; but an examination shows that neither of them could have exercised any important influence upon Heine's choice of meter. The first of these is the stanza of *Die Prager Musikantenbraut*, which appears 4 times each in Müller's collections of 1821 and 1824; Heine uses this stanza 4 times before 1821 (including the translation of Childe Harold's "Good Night"), but not at all during the whole period 1821 to 1826, and only 4 times from 1827 to 1836. Then the stanza of *Des Postillons Morgenlied*, which appears 8 times in the 77 *Gedichte* and 7 times in the *Gedichte* of 1824; this is the most frequent stanza in Heine's poems before 1821, occurring 11 times (18%, evidently beginning with the translation of Byron's "Fare thee well"); it appears only once in 1821, twice in 1822, then 12 times in 1823-4 (10%), once 1825-6, and 25 times 1827-36 (76%). It is rather striking that the *Don Ramiro* stanza, so common in Heine's poetry (occurring 4 times before 1821, twice 1821-2, 20 times or 18% in 1823-4, 4 times 1825-6, 43 times or 27% in 1827-36—far more frequently than any form of this period), does not appear at all in Müller's two collections of 1821 and 1824, and is very rare in his later verse. So the meter of *Die Grenadiere*, frequent at almost all periods of Heine's verse, appears but once in Müller's. The

rhythm of the second *Traumbild* ("Ein Traum gar seltsam schauerlich") is the most frequent form in Heine's first period, and later almost disappears (13 times or 22% before 1821, once in 1821, 4 times in 1822, once in 1823-4, 3 times in 1827-36); Müller has this meter once only until 1824, then 13 times in his last period.

In general, Müller's poems show a far greater variety of metrical forms, Heine's, on the contrary, greater variation of rhyme-order. Wherever Müller uses the stanza of *Der ewige Jude*, he clings to the rhyme-scheme aabb; Heine has four different rhyme effects for this stanza, aaaa, aabb, abab, xaya. For the *Don Ramiro* stanza, Heine has eight different rhyme effects: aabb, abab, xaya, abba, axya, assa, asas,⁶ absence of rhyme; Müller has only the first three.

Neglecting differences of rhyme-order, the following table summarizes the relative metrical variety of the two poets, Heine's poems being counted up to 1836 the figures refer to the number of different stanza forms, quite apart from the frequency of any one of them:

	MÜLLER.			HEINE.	
	Iambic-anapestic.	Trochaic-dactylic.	Mixed.	Iambic-anapestic.	Trochaic-dactylic.
Couplets	19	12	—	1	2
Three-line stanzas	3	2	—	—	1
Four-line "	37	30	—	31	13
Five-line "	5	2	—	—	—
Six-line "	16	11	—	9	5
Seven-line "	2	—	—	2	1
Eight-line ⁷ "	2	1	1	1	—
Nine-line "	—	2	—	—	—
Ten-line "	—	—	1	2	—
Twelve-line "	—	—	1	—	—
Fourteen-line "	—	1	—	—	—
Totals	84	61	3	46	22

Of the fixed foreign forms, only the sonnet is common to both poets; Heine alone uses the *ottava rima*, Müller alone uses the distich, gloss, and *ritornello*. Both have free rhythms;

6 s indicates assonance instead of rhyme.

7 Including only such as are not merely reduplications of four-line stanzas.

in metrically regular, but unstrophic and rhymeless poems, Müller has four different forms, Heine one. Altogether, Müller has 154 different metrical forms, Heine only 78 in a larger bulk of poetry covering a much longer period of time. Both poets show a marked preference for iambic-anapestic rhythms, Heine even more decidedly than Müller; the latter has 88 iambic to 65 trochaic meters, Heine 49 iambic to 22 trochaic.

Heine seems to have been much less impressed by the content of Müller's poetry than by its form. Although in his letter of June 7, 1826, Heine greets Müller as "the poet of the *Griechenlieder*," there is not the least sign of the influence of these *Griechenlieder*, to which Müller largely owed his fame, upon Heine's verse; besides, the inscription in the copy of the *Tragödien* sent to Müller appeals expressly to the "Waldhornist," not to the Tyrtæus Müller. We can easily imagine that the somewhat strained rhetoric of the *Griechenlieder* would hardly appeal to such a skeptic as Heine, who, as a matter of fact, was never carried away by the almost universal sentimental enthusiasm of the time for Hellas struggling to be free. He could, indeed, find "much poetry" in C. L. Blum's collection *Klagelieder der Griechen* (letter from Berlin, March 1, 1822: Elster vii, 569f.), but soon after he had his jest at "our Tyrtæuses" (*l. c.*, p. 579): and he never mentions Müller's *Griechenlieder*, even in *Die Romantische Schule*.

The popular romantic drinking-song and *Wanderlied*, very frequent in Müller's poetry, are scarcely found at all in Heine's; so too with the pious note of Müller's little cycle *Johannes und Esther*. Müller's poems swarm with stereotyped lyric figures, such as the miller and the miller's lass, hunter, gardener, musician, postillion, innkeeper's daughter, watchman, apprentice, and so on; of all these figures, only the knight, boatman, fisher-lass, and shepherdess play any part in Heine's poetry. Heine prefers original types, like the æsthetic tea-table of *Intermezzo* 50, or the lieutenants and ensigns of *Heinkehr* 66, to these conventional figures. In general, the *Rollenlied*, or stereotyped character lyric, which is the prevailing form with Müller, is not at all characteristic of Heine. So, too, Heine generally ex-

presses direct personal experience, while Müller for the most part works up conventional sentiments and motifs. The similarity in the treatment of nature by the two poets is doubtless due largely to common influences, especially the influence of the *Volkslied*; but here, too, the coincidences to be noted later indicate that Heine's usage was affected to some extent by his reading of Müller's poems. As poets of the sea, Heine and Müller appear to have been practically independent of each other.⁸

In this connection, the fact may be noted that the "pathetic fallacy" seems to have dawned upon Heine as an effective poetic device just at the time when he became acquainted with Müller's lyrics, in which this romantic postulation of sympathy between man and nature is a characteristic note; and even the formal parallel between the life of nature and the life of the soul, to which Elster refers as a peculiarity of Heine's style that rarely appears elsewhere, is to be found in many of Müller's lyrics.⁹

The most impressive evidence of the influence Müller's lyrics had upon Heine is to be found in the many echoes of motifs and turns of speech from Müller in Heine's poetry. The following list of striking parallels, eliminating all mere lyric commonplaces, will indicate the character and extent of this influence. The danger and difficulty of operating with such parallels is obvious; I have tried to minimize the risk of false conclusions by forming a sufficient background for this comparison, a background consisting of the lyric poetry of Goethe, Tieck, A. W. Schlegel, Brentano, Uhland, Eichendorff, the *Wunderhorn*, Büsching and v. d. Hagen, *Sammlung deutscher Volkslieder*, Berlin, 1807, and Ziska and Schottky's *Österreichische Volkslieder*, Pesth, 1819. For

8 The Vineta question in its larger aspect—the sunken city in legend and in the works of Heine, Müller, and others—must be reserved for another study. It need only to be stated here that Müller's *Vineta*, which first appeared in the autumn of 1826, was of course unknown to Heine when he wrote his *Seegespenst* in 1825; and that, though Heine quotes Müller's *Vineta* in his *Nordsee* iii (Elster iii, 102), his own conception of the sunken city remained unaffected by it.

9 Elster, *Heinrich Heines Buch der Lieder*, Heilbronn 1887, p. xx, lxxvii; P. S. Allen in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iii, 71.

Müller's lyrics, quoted from the two-volume edition by Max Müller, Brockhaus, 1868, the date of first publication is given; for Heine's, quoted from Elster's edition, the date of composition, and in case of doubt with an interrogation point.¹⁰

The argument for the influence of Müller upon Heine in the passages to be quoted rests upon the following facts: that there is no corresponding similarity with all the mass of other lyric poetry studied; that the parallel passages, almost without exception, appear in Müller's poetry earlier than in Heine's; that the coincident passages in Heine's verse belong almost exclusively to the years 1821–24, or are later echoes from these years, the very ones for which Heine testifies to Müller's influence upon him. In a few isolated cases the dates indicate either mere chance coincidence or the possible influence of Heine upon Müller. A few of the parallels here given were noted previously by Karl Hessel, *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht* iii, 47ff., and P. S. Allen, *Journal of Germanic Philology* iii, 35ff.

Before passing to Müller's poems, let us note a striking parallel with a passage from his book of travels *Rom, Römer und Römerinnen*, 1820. It is pretty certain that Heine read this book just before starting on his walk through the Harz; for he made a study of books of Italian travel after his return to Göttingen early in 1824 (Goedeke, *Grundriss*, 1st ed., iii, 449), and he shows his acquaintance with this particular book, as well as with Müller's letters to *Hermes* in 1821, by special reference to them in his *Italien* (Elster, iii, 266). The passage in question is a lyric outburst of Müller as he turns from a subject grown tedious to the freedom of nature:

"... und so will ich Dich denn heute in freier, grüner Natur für das trockene Feld schadlos halten, das Du ... mit mir durchwandelt hast. Auf die Berge wollen wir steigen und uns umschauen in der blühenden Gegend: wir wollen in die Hütte des Landmannes treten, nach seinen Geschäften ihn befragen und von seinen Früchten kosten. . . (p. 113).

Here Heine seems to have found the thrice repeated keynote of the Prologue to his

10 Gedd.=Gedichte; Hk.=Heimkehr; L. I.=Lyrisches Intermezzo; N. F.=Neuer Frühling; Rom.=Romanzen,

Harzreise: "Auf die Berge will ich steigen, Wo die frommen Hütten stehen, Wo die Brust sich frei erschliesset Und die freien Lüfte wehen." The same keynote is sounded again in the poem *Elster* ii, 69, originally in the *Harzreise*: Auf die Berge will ich steigen, Auf die schroffen Felsenhöhn.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

ALFRED'S SOLILOQUIES AND CYNEWULF'S CHRIST.

THERE is at least one passage in the *Soliloquies* which suggests acquaintance with the *Christ*. It is that near the beginning of Book III, where Alfred is discussing the future condition of the righteous and the wicked, and especially the increase of happiness and misery due in each case to the sight of the other band. This obviously resembles *Chr.* 1234 ff. It might be presupposed that we are prevented from assuming direct borrowing by Alfred, by the fact that Gregory the Great (*Patr. Lat.* 76. 1308), and perhaps other Fathers, had developed the thought, which in the last analysis no doubt goes back to the story of the rich man and Lazarus. What strengthens the probability, however, of borrowing from the *Christ*, is the occurrence of certain words in both passages. Thus, *wuldor* and *wite*: (*Chr.*) *wuldor* 1243; *wite*, 1249, 1269, 1292; (*Sol.*) *wuldor*, 65. 11, 22, 23; *wite* 65. 12, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23 (I quote from Mr. Henry L. Hargrove's forthcoming edition). So (*ge*)*sēoð*: *Chr.* 1244, 1253, 1256, 1270, 1285, 1291, 1300; *Sol.* 65. 14, 16, 19. With *pā hwile þe hī on þisse weorulde wēron* (*Sol.* 65. 13) cf. the sentences beginning with *penden* (-an): *Chr.* 590, 597, 772, 800, 814, 817, 1325, 1574, 1579, 1583. But perhaps the most striking parallel is suggested by *Sol.* 55. 23: *ælc hæfð be hys gearnunge swā wite, swā wuldor, swæðer hē on byð*. This recalls *Chr.* 595-6: *swā wite, . . . swā wuldor, . . . swā him lēofre bið tō gefremmanne*. We have the combination again, it is true, in *Soul and Body* 7-8: *swā wite, swā wuldor, swā him in worulde ær efne þæt eorðfæt ær geworhte*. On the ques-

tion of Cynewulfian parallels compare those adduced in my article on the *Wærferth* preface in *MOD. LANG. NOTES* 17. 7 ff.

A peculiar combination of *ær* and *æfter* is found in our text and in the *Judith*. *Sol.* 55. 26 has: *ælc hæfð be þām andefnum þe hē ær æfter æarnað*; and *Jud.* 65: *swylcne hē ær æfter worhte*.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

CHAUCER'S 'bees.'

"Next, o'er his books his eyes began to roll,
In pleasing memory of all he stole,
How here he sipp'd, how there he plunder'd snug,
And suck'd all o'er, like an industrious bug,"
The Dunciad i, 127-130.

A contributor of *Notes and Queries* for May 17, 1851 (p. 387), because of "the incongruity of the terms 'sipp'd' and 'industrious' as applied to 'bug', argues that "Pope may have originally written this passage with the words 'free' and 'bee', as the rhymes of the last two lines." This is an uncalled for elutiation, not an elucidation, of the text. It serves, however, to call to mind the curious text-history of line 353 of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*, which is well told by Prof. Lounsbury (*Studies in Chaucer* i, 242 f.). "There can be scarcely any doubt that *flies* was what Chaucer wrote," says Prof. Lounsbury (although he had previously received *bees* into the text of his edition of the poem). Chaucer 'withoute doute' wrote *flies*, but why? The answer, though simple, may be worth a moment's attention.

The modern reader must be reminded of the obsolete generic use of *fly*, 'any winged insect; as the bee, gnat, locust, moth, etc.' [*N. E. D.*], with which is to be compared the use of French *mouche*. In Chaucer's day it was common to use not only the specific name, as *bee* (cf. French *abeille*, and Old French *e pl. es*), but also the particularized generic name, as 'the fly that maketh the honey' (cf. *He is ase þe smale ulge þet makeþ þet hony. Ayeub.* 136, quoted in *N. E. D.*; *these flyinge flies that we clepen been. Chaucer, Boeth.* iii, metr. vii; also *The Parson's Tale* 469), which is also paralleled in